

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 7,111,175 to Ripley (hereinafter Ripley) in view of United States Patent Number 7,216,369 to Wiseman (hereinafter Wiseman). Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ripley in view of Wiseman and in further view of United States Patent Number 7,124,317 to Yoshino et al. (hereinafter Yoshino). Claim 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ripley in view of Wiseman and in further view of Second Copy 200, software release noted November, 1999 (hereinafter Second Copy 2000). Claims 7, 11, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Publication Number 2001/0003517 by Nonaka et al. (hereinafter Nonaka) in view of Yoshino. Claims 8-10 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nonaka in view of Yoshino and Wiseman. Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nonaka in view of Yoshino, Wiseman, and Second Copy 2000. Claims 17, 18, 20-23, 25-28, and 30 stand rejected as unpatentable over Ripley in view of Yoshino. Claims 19, 24, and 29 stand rejected as unpatentable over Ripley in view of Yoshino and Nonaka.

For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicants' remarks are presented in substantially the same order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action. Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the

differences between the claimed invention and the cited references.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of September 7, 2007. We discussed proposed limitations to the claims. Applicants agreed to submit the amendment for all independent claims. Applicants have done so with this response, modifying the amendment to more closely employ the disclosure of the specification.

Amendments to the Claims.

Applicants have amended claim 17 with the limitation "...initializing a password module in response to verifying a cryptographic module by comparing a known value stored on the password module to a cryptographic module platform configuration register value storing a hash of POST BIOS code, wherein only the cryptographic module may initialize the password module..." Claims 1, 7, 13, 22, and 27 are similarly amended. The amendment is well supported by claims 4, 14, 20, 25, and 30 and the specification. See page 11, ¶ 41; page 13, ¶ 47.

Claim 7 is also amended with the limitations of claim 8. Claims 4, 14, 20, 25, 30 are canceled. Claims 5 and 9 are amended to depend from pending claims. Claims 10 and 11 are amended to cure informalities.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ripley in view of Wiseman. Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ripley in view of Wiseman and in further view of Yoshino. Claim 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ripley in view of Wiseman and in further view of Second Copy 2000. Claims 7, 11, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Nonaka in view of Yoshino. Claims 8-10 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nonaka in view of Yoshino and Wiseman. Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nonaka in view of Yoshino, Wiseman, and Second Copy 2000. Claims 17, 18, 20-23, 25-28, and 30 stand rejected as unpatentable over Ripley in view of Yoshino. Claims 19, 24, and 29 stand rejected as unpatentable over Ripley in view of Yoshino and Nonaka. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 17 as amended includes the limitation "...initializing a password module in response to verifying a cryptographic module by comparing a known value stored on the password module to a cryptographic module platform configuration register value storing a hash of POST BIOS code, wherein only the cryptographic module may initialize the password module..." Claims 1, 7, 13, 22, and 27 are similarly amended. Ripley, Nonaka, Yoshino, Wiseman, and Second Copy 2000 all do not teach initializing a password module in response to verifying a cryptographic module by comparing a known value stored on the password module to a cryptographic module platform configuration register value storing a hash of POST BIOS code, wherein only the cryptographic module may initialize the password module. Applicants therefore submit that claims 1, 7, 13, 17, 22, and 27 are allowable. Applicants further submit that claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 9-12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, and 29 are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

Conclusion

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicants assert that the application is in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler
Reg. No. 38,527
Attorney for Applicant

Date: September 12, 2007
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 322-1054